

**REMARKS**

Claims 3-24 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 6, 9, 15, and 20 are amended. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 3-5 and 10-14 are allowed.

The Office Action objects to claims 8 and 17 because of informalities. More particularly, the Examiner indicates that “[i]t is unclear ... how black matrices are formed longitudinally (parallel) in a direction crossing (oblique to) the barrier ribs.” However, dependent claims 8 and 17 recite that the black matrices are formed at each longitudinal end of the plurality of barrier ribs in a direction crossing the plurality of barrier ribs. Thus, the black matrices are formed at each end of the barrier ribs and extend in a direction perpendicular to the barrier ribs. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lu. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Lu reference was filed May 18, 2000. A certified translation of the priority documents for the above-identified application is filed herewith, to effectuate the priority claim to November 24, 1999. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 6 over Lu is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 15-17 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ohsawa. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ohsawa discloses a plasma display system. As shown in Figure 2, referred to by the Examiner, black matrices 5 are provided above barrier ribs 2 at edges of each display cell S. However, amended independent claim 15 recites that the display area comprises a plurality of discharge cells, the non-display area is provided at an outer periphery of the display area, and black matrices are provided on one of an upper or lower substrate in the non-display area and are configured for non-transmission of light. Ohsawa fails to disclose or suggest such features as Ohsawa discloses providing black matrices between and at the periphery of individual display or discharge cells and not in a non-display region provided at an outer periphery of a display area comprising a plurality of discharge cells. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Ohsawa of providing black matrices in such a non-display region.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 15 over Ohsawa should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 16-17 and 24 are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 15, from which they depend, as well as for their added features, and the combination thereof.

The Office Action rejected claims 9, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lepselter. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Lepselter discloses a gas discharge flat-panel display and method for making the same. In the embodiment shown in Figure 9, referred to by the Examiner, a display panel 90 includes a

discharge space 60 bordered by columns 66 provided on a substrate 14'. A white phosphor layer 78 and insulating layer 62 are provided in each discharge cell adjacent an airbridge 50.

However, independent claim 9 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that the display region comprises a plurality of discharge cells and the non-display region is provided at an outer periphery of the display region, wherein the protective layer is provided only on the display region so as to cover substantially the entire display region. Further, amended independent claim 20 recites that the display area comprises a plurality of discharge cells and the non-display area is provided at an outer periphery of the display area, wherein a protective layer is provided on an upper substrate only in the display area so as to cover substantially the entire display area. Lepselter does not disclose or suggest such features as Lepselter merely teaches providing an insulating layer 62 in individual discharge cells 60 delimited by the barriers 66.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 9 and 20 over Lepselter should be withdrawn. Dependent claim 21 is allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 20, from which it depends, as well as for its added features, and the combination thereof.

The Office Action rejected claims 6-8, 18-19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohsawa in view of Park. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 6 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that the display region comprises a plurality of discharge cells and the non-display region is provided at an outer periphery of the display region, wherein the non-display region is provided with black matrices

for shutting out light. As discussed above, Ohsawa does not disclose or suggest such features. Further, Park fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ohsawa, as Park was merely cited to teach a pair of sustaining electrodes of transparent conductive material.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 6 over the combination of Ohsawa and Park should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 7-8, 18-19, and 23 are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 6 and 15, from which they ultimately depend, as well as for their added features, and the combination thereof.

The Office Action rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lepselter in view of Ohsawa. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 22 is allowable over Lepselter at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 20, from which it depends, as well as for its added features, and the combination thereof. Further, Ohsawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Lepselter, as Ohsawa is merely cited to teach the use of black matrices on the upper or lower substrate. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 22 over the combination of Lepselter and Ohsawa should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Carol L. Druzick, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 09/717,284  
Reply to Office Action dated February 17, 2004

Docket No. YHK-057

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
Carol L. Druzbeck  
Registration No. 40,287

Encs.: Verified English Translations of:  
P1999-52536  
P1999-52535  
P1999-52534

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3701 DYK:CLD/kah/dcp

**Date: June 17, 2004**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**